

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-23 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 6, 7, and 23 are independent. In the Office Action dated January 25, 2008, Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18 and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). In addition, Claims 4, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 3-23 remain in this application, with Claim 2 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer by the Amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Supervisor Najjar for the courtesy of a telephone interview on May 19, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, the Supervisor indicated that while such a recitation may overcome the cited reference and further prosecute the application, further searching would be necessary. No agreement was reached regarding patentability..

II. Rejection of the Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18 and 20-23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action dated January 25, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18 and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0010612A1 ("Pandya"). Claims 1, 6, 7 and 23 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "read operations are implemented using RDMA and write operations

are implemented using send operations, wherein the write operations are not implemented using RDMA.” Amended Claim 6, 7 and 23 include a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 23, lines 14-16.

In contrast, *Pandya* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Pandya* discloses that a target prepares data to be read, block 3504, and then performs remote direct memory access (RDMA) write operations, block 3505 to directly deposit read data into RDMA buffers at an initiator without host intervention. (See page 18, paragraph [0140]). Further, *Pandya* discloses a write command follows a similar flow to that in Fig. 39. (See page 20, paragraph [0165]). In addition, *Pandya* discloses a host driver queues a command in processor a command queue in a storage flow/RDMA controller. (See page 19, paragraph [0144]). Because *Pandya* merely discloses that a target prepares data to be read and performs RDMA write operations, *Pandya* does not disclose write operations are not implemented using RDMA. Rather, *Pandya* merely discloses that an RDMA is used for write operations.

Pandya does not anticipate the claimed subject matter because *Pandya* at least does not disclose “read operations are implemented using RDMA and write operations are implemented using send operations, wherein the write operations are not implemented using RDMA,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 6, 7 and 23 include a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 6, 7 and 23 are distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 3-5 and 8-22 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 7, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3-5 and 8-22.

In addition to the above recitation, amended Claim 23 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, “wherein the first computer requests a server request resume key and the second computer passes the server request resume key as an authentication mechanism, wherein after authentication, the first computer opens a pipe to the second computer and queries the second computer for a list of shared RDMA-capable providers.” Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at least on page 12, lines 10-15 and page 13, lines 6-10.

In contrast, *Pandya* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Pandya* discloses that a SCSI commands and a block data transfers related to the commands are implemented as command queues, which get executed on a processor. (See page 7, paragraph [0100]). Because *Pandya* is completely silent on a first computer requesting a server request resume key and a second computer passing the server request resume key as an authentication mechanism, *Pandya* does not disclose a first and second computer using a server request resume key for authentication. Rather *Pandya* discloses that commands are implemented as command queues which get executed on a processor.

Pandya does not anticipate the claimed subject matter because *Pandya* at least does not disclose “wherein the first computer requests a server request resume key and the second computer passes the server request resume key as an authentication mechanism, wherein after authentication, the first computer opens a pipe to the second computer and queries the second computer for a list of shared RDMA-capable providers,” as recited by amended Claim 23. Accordingly, independent Claim 23 is distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 23.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5064

Date: June 24, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

AH/wlp/rjm

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE